# Bio-D Advantage

**AC Shell**

WTO trade agreements prioritize resource extraction over environmental protection and kill global biodiversity.

**James 11** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

For decades, governments have worked together through the United Nations to develop agreements to protect the natural resources of our shared planet. Unfortunately, so-called **“free trade agreements” threaten to erode** many of the advances in **global environmental protection, endangering** our planet and the **natural resources** necessary to support life. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and **certain agreements of the** World Trade Organization (**WTO**) were written to **prioritize** rights for **corporations over protections for our** shared **environment**. But rather than being repealed, corporate interests are negotiating the expansion of these corporate rights. The U.S.-Dominican Republic-Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), soon to go before Congress, and the proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), currently in negotiations, are modeled on NAFTA. In addition, negotiations are proceeding within the WTO to expand many of its policies. **These** new **agreements threaten global biodiversity**, would accelerate the spread of genetically engineered (GE) crops, increase natural resource exploitation, further degrade some of the most critical environmental regions on the planet, and erode the public’s ability to protect our planet for future generations. No Protections for the Environment Neither CAFTA nor the FTAA require member countries to adopt internationally recognized standards for environmental protection. Nor does either agreement ensure that member countries don’t lower or waive their existing environmental laws in an effort to attract investment. What’s more, rules in CAFTA and the FTAA would actually prohibit member countries from enacting many new environmental regulations, allowing those regulations to be challenged as “barriers to trade.” This strips the public from a fundamental democratic right to pass laws that protect our environment in favor of corporations’ “right” to profit from environmental destruction. Mega-Diverse Countries **Latin America is one of the most biologically** and culturally **diverse regions on the planet**. Four of the five Central American countries included in CAFTA have tropical areas that have been identified as “critical regions” for their biodiversity. Additionally, **7 of the world’s 12 “megadiverse” countries**, (Mexico, Brazil, Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Costa Rica and Colombia) **are found in the Americas. “Mega-diversity” countries represent the majority of the world’s biodiversity and** surviving **Indigenous peoples, the true guardians of biodiversity**. Unfortunately, so-called **“free trade” agreements** **directly contradict** important international legislation designed to protect the rights of Indigenous peoples and biodiversity, like **the Convention on Bio**logical **Diversity as well as the International Labor Organization Convention** 169, **which states that Indigenous groups must be consulted on issues that affect their** rights to **land and livelihood**. Piracy of Global Biodiversity In the last decade, the **biodiversity** of the Americas **has been targeted by “life science” corporations** (the growing consolidation of pharmaceutical, agrichemical and seed companies) in search of “green gold.” These corporations are pillaging humankind’s patrimony of traditional knowledge and biodiversity **to create** and patent **drugs and ag**ricultural **products** to sell **for profit**. The quest to patent life forms, especially medicinal plants and crops, threatens our food security, access to healthcare, and the biological and cultural diversity of the Americas. Intellectual property rules in CAFTA and the FTAA would require that member countries grant protections to the patenting of life forms. This would facilitate a massive increase in “bioprospecting” or the practice of corporations patenting Indigenous communities’ knowledge of plants and then profiting from that knowledge – while forcing Indigenous communities to pay for what they had previously held in common.

Scientific consensus goes aff. Biodiversity is key to survival.

**Swilling 12** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

Seven globally significant, mainstream documents will, in one way or another, shape the way our generation sees the world which we need to change. These are as follows: • **Ecosystem degradation**. The United Nations (UN) Millennium Ecosystem **Assessment**, compiled **by 1,360 scientists** from 95 countries and released in 2005 (with virtually no impact beyond the environmental sciences), has **confirmed** for the first time that **60% of** the **ecosystems upon which human systems depend for survival are degraded**.7 • Global **warming**. The broadly accepted reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change confirm that global warming is taking place due to release into the atmosphere of greenhouse gases caused by, among other things, the burning of fossil fuels, and that if average temperatures increase by 2˚C or more this **is going to lead to major** ecological and socio-economic changes, most of them for the worse, and the world’s poor will experience the most destructive **consequences**.17 • Oil peak. The 2008 World Energy Outlook, published by the International Energy Agency, declared the ‘end of cheap oil’.18 Although there is still some dispute over whether we have hit peak oil production or not, the fact remains that **mainstream perspectives** now broadly **agree with** the once vilified ‘**peak oil**’ perspective (see www.peakoil.net). Even the major oil companies now agree that oil prices are going to rise and alternatives to oil must be found sooner rather than later. Oil accounts for over 60% of the global economy’s energy needs. Our cities and global economy depend on cheap oil and changing this means a fundamental rethink of the assumptions underpinning nearly a century of urban planning dogma. • Inequality. According to the UN Human Development Report for 1998, 20% of the global population who live in the richest countries account for 86% of total private consumption expenditure, whereas the poorest 20% account for 1.3%.19 Only the most callous still ignore the significance of inequality as a driver of many threats to social cohesion and a decent quality of life for all. • Urban majority. According to generally accepted UN reports, the majority (i.e. just over 50%) of the world’s population was living in urban areas by 2007.6 According to the UN habitat report entitled The Challenge of Slums, one billion of the six billion people who live on the planet live in slums or, put differently, one-third of the world’s total urban population (rising to over 75% in the least developed countries) live in slums or what we refer to in South Africa as informal settlements.20 • Food insecurity. The International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development21 is the most thorough global assessment of the state of agricultural science and practice that has ever been conducted. According to this report, modern **industrial**, chemical-intensive **agriculture has caused significant ecological degradation which**, in turn, **will threaten food security** in a world in which access to food is already highly unequal and demand is fast outstripping supply. Significantly, this report confirmed that ‘23% of all used land is degraded to some degree’.21 • Material flows. According to a 2011 report by the International Resource Panel (http://www.unep.org/resourcepanel), by 2005 the global economy depended on 60 billion tonnes of primary resources (biomass, fossil fuels, metals and industrial and construction minerals) and 500 exajoules of energy, an increase of 36% since 1980.22 **The** above **trends** combine to **conjure** up **a** picture of a highly unequal urbanised **world, dependent on rapidly degrading ecosystem services, with looming threats** triggered by climate change, high oil prices, food insecurities and resource depletion. **This is** what the **mainstream literature** on unsustainable development is worried about. This marks what is now increasingly referred to as the Anthropocene – the era in which humans have become the primary force of historico-geophysical evolution.23 Significantly, although these seven documents are in the policy domain they reflect the outcomes of many **years of** much **deeper research** on global change **by scientists** and researchers working **across disciplines** and diverse contexts on all continents. Although this process of scientific inquiry leading to policy change is most dramatic with respect to climate science,24 it is also true for the life sciences that fed into the outcomes expressed in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, the resource economics that has slowly established the significance of rising oil prices and, most recently, of all the rise of material flow analysis (more on these later). **The** rise of our **ability to ‘see the planet’ has given rise to** what Clark et al. have appropriately called **the ‘second** Copernican **revolution’**.25 The first, of course, goes back to the publication of De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium by Copernicus in 1530, but only ‘proven’ a century later by Galileo, who established by observation that Copernicus was correct when he claimed that the sun rather than Earth was the centre of the universe. This brilliant act of defining the planetary system through observation was a – perhaps the – defining moment that paved the way for the Enlightenment and the industrial epoch that followed. Clark et al. date the second Copernican revolution to the meeting in 2001 when delegates from over 100 countries signed the Amsterdam Declaration which established the ‘Earth-System Science Partnership’.25 The logical outcome of this profound paradigm shift is an increasingly sophisticated appreciation of what Rockstrom et al. have called our **‘planetary boundaries’** which **define the ‘safe operating space for humanity’**.26 The significance of the Rockstrom article is that it managed to integrate, for the first time, the quantifications of these ‘planetary boundaries’ that had already been established by various mono-disciplines. These included some key markers, such as not exceeding 350 parts per million of CO2 in the atmosphere; extracting 35 million tonnes of nitrogen from the atmosphere per year; an extinction rate of 10; global freshwater use of 4 000 km3 per year, and a fixed percentage of global land cover converted to cropland.26 Without the ‘second Copernican revolution’ a new science appropriate for a more sustainable world and the associated ethics would be unviable.

**Impact Ext**

Biodiversity loss causes extinction and Latin American biodiversity is uniquely key.

**Takacs 96**[[3]](#footnote-3)

So **biodiversity keeps the world running.** It has value and of itself, as well as for us. Raven, Erwin, and Wilson oblige us to think about the value of biodiversity for our own lives. The Ehrlichs’ rivet-popper trope makes this same point; by eliminating rivets, we play Russian roulette with global ecology and human futures: “It is likely that **destruction of** the rich complex of **species in the Amazon** basin **could** trigger rapid changes in global climate patterns. Agriculture remains heavily dependent on stable climate, and human beings remain heavily dependent on food. By the end of the century the extinction of perhaps a million species in the Amazon basin could have **entrain**ed **famines** in which a billion human beings perished. And if our species is very unlucky, the **famines could lead to** a thermo**nuclear war, which could extinguish civilization.**” 13 Elsewhere Ehrlich uses different particulars with no less drama: What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? **Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain** in the face of climatic change, soil erosion, loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. **Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate**; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. **Air pollution will increase**, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forgo many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's well­stocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, **mortality from respiratory** and epidemic **disease, natural disasters, and** especially **famine will lower life expectancies** to the point where can­cer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. **Humanity will bring** up**on itself consequences** depressingly **similar to** those expected from **a nuclear winter.** Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that **civili­zation will disappear** some time **before the end of the next century** - not with a bang but a whimper.

Biodiversity loss causes extinction. **Tuxill and Bight 98** write[[4]](#footnote-4)

The loss of species touches everyone, for no matter where or how we live, **biodiversity is the basis for our existence. Earth's endowment of species provides humanity with food, fiber, and** many other products and "natural **services**" **for which there simply is no substitute.** Biodiversity underpins our health care systems: some 25 percent of drugs prescribed in the United States include chemical compounds derived from wild organisms, and **billions** of people **worldwide rely on plant- and animal- based traditional medicine for their primary health care.** Biodiversity provides a wealth of genes essential for maintaining the vigor of our crops and livestock.

Biodiversity loss causes extinction. **Diner 94** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems are inherently more stable than less diverse systems: "**'The more complex the ecosystem, the more** successfully **it can resist** a **stress.**..[l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." By causing widespread extinctions humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. **As biological simplicity rises, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara desert in Africa, and the dustbowl** conditions **of** the 1930s in **the U.S. are** relatively **mild examples** of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, **each new** animal or plant **extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse, and human extinction.** Certainly, each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

# Ag Advantage

## AC Shell

High resource extraction leads to water depletion, agriculture destruction and soil erosion.

**Aachen Foundation 10** writes[[6]](#footnote-6)

The **environmental impacts of resource extraction grow with** the **overall volume of resource ﬂows**. Increasing total material requirements will lead to growing environmental change, at different locations on the globe, with varying local and regional effects. Effects may differ depending on the region and its bio-geographical conditions. Total resource ﬂows tend to damage eco-system functions and services in different ways: **clearing** the **vegetation expands with the scale of open pit mines**; **the higher the amount of** total **extraction, the more water must be pumped out to keep the mine running; ground water levels will be reduced** at a wider scale**; water depletion** and pollution **may impact** human settlements, **adjacent agriculture** or natural eco-systems**; the larger the volume of extraction, the higher** both **the** amount of **subsequent disposal and** the **extent of landscape changes** becomes, as well as the succeeding requirements for rehabilitation; worldwide, restoration of mining sites remains limited; the higher the amount of mining waste from metal mining, the higher the risk of acid mine drainage and metal pollution of water bodies becomes, also after mine closure; the higher the amount of total extraction by underground mines, the higher the risk of subsidence after mine closure; the **loss of fertile top soil by erosion may lead to severe degradation** and the abandonment **of** the **ﬁelds**, inducing farmers to convert natural land to cropland elsewhere; new quarries for construction minerals, gravel, sand, crushed stone, and earth may represent hot spots of interference with nature conservation.

Water wars cause global nuclear war. **Weiner 90**[[7]](#footnote-7)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And **in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East,** from North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, **tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching** what many experts describe as **a flashpoint. A climate shift** in that single battle-scarred nexus **might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads** the world has stockpiled since Trinity

Destruction of agriculture independently risks extinction.

**FAO 11** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

As pressure on the world's water resources reaches unsustainable levels in an increasing number of regions, **a "business-as-usual" approach to** economic **development and** natural **resource management** **will no longer be possible**, FAO said today. Agriculture will be key to the implementation of sustainable water management, the Organization told attendees at an international meeting on water, energy and food security being held in Bonn. Speaking on the sidelines at the Bonn 2011 Nexus Conference, FAO Assistant Director-General for Natural Resources, Alexander Mueller, said: "**Tackling** the challenges of **food security,** economic **development and energy security in a context of ongoing population growth will require** a renewed and re-imagined focus on **agricultural development.** Agriculture can and should become the backbone of tomorrow's green economy." The conference in Bonn has been convened by Germany's Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development as a lead up to the UN's "Rio+20" Conference on Sustainable development in June 2012. It brings together leading actors in economic development, natural resource management and environmental policy and the food and energy sectors to look for new approaches to managing the interconnections between water, energy and food. Holistic vision, sectoral solutions FAO estimates that **to feed** a world population expected to number around **9 billion people in 2050, global food production will need to be increased by 70 percent**. Global energy demand will increase by 36 percent by 2035, and competition for water between farming, cities and industry will continue to intensify as a result. "It's time to stop treating food, water and energy as separate issues and tackle the challenge of intelligently balancing the needs of these three sectors, building on synergies, finding opportunities to reduce waste and identifying ways that water can be shared and reused, rather than competed for," Mueller said. Agriculture at the center of the nexus According to Mueller, agriculture lies at the centre of the "water-energy-food nexus. "**When you start looking at** the issue of **how we are going to provide food, water, light, heat and other services** and products **for 9 billion people, it becomes** quite **clear that agriculture is** perhaps **the linchpin of everything**,**"** he said. "If we have the political will and farsightedness, we can make agriculture the engine of tomorrow's green economy. Climate-smart farming systems that make efficient use of resources like water, land, and energy must become the basis of tomorrow's agricultural economy."

# GMO Adv

**AC Shell**

The PP conflicts with WTO trade agreements on GMOs.

**Borjeson 7** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

**The P**recautionary **P**rinciple **is one of the most important** and well-known **environmental policies governing trade**, both nationally and internationally. The scope of this study will however be limited to the definition presented in Sandin 1999, where the author has identified four common elements of the principle from a number of definitions: “if there is a threat, which is uncertain, then some kind of action is mandatory” (Sandin 1999 quoted in Sandin et al 2002: 290). Or in other words: “on some occasions, measures against a possible hazard Principlerelated variables Outcome of GMO-dispute Process of GMO-dispute Politicallyand economically related variables Case-related variables Aims and actions of the WTO Aims and actions based on the Precautionary Principle 15 should be taken even if the available evidence is not enough to conclude the existence of the hazard as a scientific fact” (Sandin et al 2002: 288). Note however that an evaluation of the Precautionary Principle will not be done as such, seeing as the case-study is too limited in scope for this purpose and will therefore mainly be descriptive. The principle will be explored more thoroughly in section 4.5 Key Provisions of the Precautionary Principle. The WTO agreements on trade include a number of multilateral agreements aimed at liberalizing international trade and certainly not all of them are referred to within this study. More precisely, the principle governing the de-regulated trade is one of the principles stated in the preamble of the agreements establishing the world trade organization. Namely: “entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international trade relations (…), to develop an integrated, more viable and durable multilateral trading system”. In relation to the Precautionary Principle, the **WTO agreements state that** the right to take **precaution**ary measures **is only approved if** they are **not applied in a manner which would** result in “arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between countries, or a disguised **restrict**ion on international **trade**” (www.wto.org). Hence when the term WTO agreements on trade is used these are “the principles” being referred to. A more detailed exposition of the agreements will be given in the section 4.3 Key provisions on the WTO agreements on trade. Since this study concerns one case, this together with the purposive limitation of material makes the results less useful when generalizing and applying the findings of this study to a larger context and since this is a qualitative study the findings could be subject to other interpretations (Creswell 1994: 111). However, it makes a contribution to the ongoing debate on the concerned matter as the case-study has a high representativity when discussing the matter of subject. Although Rational Choice theory is used to explain causality, a complete causal approach will not be used. Since the study only handles one case and only one set of variables (the principle-related) a qualitative evaluation of the influence on the outcome by the independent variables concerned: the Precautionary Principle and the WTO agreements on trade will be done instead. Moreover, since the study is limited to one case it will not be possible to test the regularity of the variables. What it can however, is to study the presumable correlation in a case where the two conflicting principles are involved. The second phrase in research question nr 2: How were the two principles balanced in the outcome and why, might however be too difficult to fully answer with this limited approach. 16 Practical limitations An important methodological aspect of any scientific study concerns its validity and if the chosen indicators correspond to the chosen theoretical concepts (Yin 2003: 34). A validity fault could follow the purposive limitation of the factors being studied; in the concerned case this could be the result of focus being on the principle-related variables and not on all of the factors influencing the process and outcome. This limitation might result in the study not covering the conflict in its whole and leads to the question: will the study measure what it intends to measure, even when being limited to the chosen variables? The occurring regularity of the two principles in the process of the dispute together with legislative measures being based upon them indicates validity throughout the study. Moreover, the long process surrounding the conflict implies that this study focuses on a central and relevant issue. Another methodological aspect concerns the reliability of the study and the handling of the material used (Yin 2003: 38). One way to get around this uncertainty is by external reliability verification: to have another person read the material used and then to compare the results to see if these concur. This has however not been done in this study and consequently there is really no way getting around this problem. What has been done however, is internal reliability verification where the material has been read several times in order to be as sure as possible of what was actually said and concluded. A practical limitation of this study is time. Another is cost. The limited time-frame has put restrictions both on the research objective and the material used; interviews could for example have been a fruitful complement to the documents. Another practical limitation concerns the documents used. The case-study does not provide an examination of the submissions made by all complaining parties. This clearly puts limitations to both the study and its findings, but it has nonetheless been necessary to put a limit to the sources used. The documents used in the case-study are 1) the First Written Submission by the United States, 2) the First Written Submission by the European Communities and 3) the final Reports of the Dispute Settlement Panel. The reason for only looking at the US Submission and not the submissions of all the complaining parties in more detail is, again, the limited timeframe. Nevertheless, the material chosen is enough to illustrate the principle-related conflict. Finally, the issue being covered is in many ways a legal issue. I am however not a legal expert and the study will not be conducted within the realm of science of international law. Last there is the issue of my own personal bias and limits as a researcher, as has so clearly been pointed out: “the ethnographer enters the field with an open mind, not an empty head” 17 (Fetterman 1989 as quoted in Creswell 1994: 44). I might overlook certain issues and be limited in my knowledge of others. Hopefully those weaknesses will be overcome by the study being exposed to peer-review along with help from my supervisor. 2.4 Earlier research This study will be done in the context of environmental social science. It has been acknowledged that social sciences play an important part in environmental science and that it is of importance that they participate and are incorporated in research on sustainable development (www.formas.se). Sustainable development is however a very broad focus area and there really is no point in giving a thorough exposition on all of the previous research concerning it. So, the research focused on in this section mainly concerns the conflict between the trade related and environmentally protecting regimes and the incompatibility between them and the principles concerned. Furthermore, it touches the subject of how the Precautionary Principle stands in conflict with matters of trade. The earlier research consists of relevant articles on the matter, mostly articles within the realm of law and international agreements. The media of articles are chosen since they often are the bearers of the most recent information and new findings on a certain subject matter within a research area. They are also the easiest to find and duplicate (Creswell 1994: 28). There is no lack of writings on the conflict between environmental international regimes and agreements concerned with the matter of trade and the topic is clearly being discussed on the international arena (Schoenbaum 2000: 866). The **two regimes** principally **regulating** the international **trade with g**enetically **m**odified **o**rganism**s are the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and** the **W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization **Agreements** on trade. Previous studies have begun mapping where the regimes are in in-coherence with each other and the reasons to why one prevails over the other when faced in matters of dispute. When addressing the potential conflict between the two principles: **the P**recautionary **P**rinciple **and** the **WTO agreements** on trade, it has been found that also these two **contradict**. It has been proposed that while under the current WTO agreements and with the current definitions of the Precautionary Principle, **no full reconciliation** of the Precautionary Principle and trade liberalisation **is possible** (Matthee and Vermersch 2000: 69). Earlier studies have also concluded that one of the key issues in this debate is the extent to which the Precautionary Principle should be applied. It has been shown that **the Biosafety Protocol and** agreements under the umbrella of the **WTO agreements** on trade **contradict** each other on this 18 point **and** that **this will lead to future conflicts** (Schoenbaum 2000: 866). Trade- and environmental agreements aspire to be mutually supportive, but achieving this requires substantial harmonisation between the two. It has been found that each of the agreements treats the Precautionary Principle differently and the idea has been presented that there is a great risk that parties in trade disputes in GMOs will use either agreement depending on each party’s status in each agreement (http://ideas.repec.org). The area of research is only in its beginning and we are still to discover what the outcome of the GMO-case is going to have in practice. As stated earlier in the text, the outcome on the matter by the WTO Dispute Panel might very well come to have far reaching implications for the global governance of GMOs, possibilities for environmental protection and for international trade relations. To conclude: it has been found that **there is** an **incoherence between** the **regimes governing environmental protection and international trade** and that this incoherence applies to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the WTO agreements on trade. The two internationally recognized principals: the Precautionary Principle and the WTO agreements are found to be in conflict and it has been proposed that no reconciliation between them in their current form is possible. It is further emphasized that there is a need to address this issue because the contradiction on how to use the Precautionary Principle will lead to further conflicts and this will undoubtedly result in obstacles on the road to sustainable development. Here is where the importance of this study comes into the picture. If we are to achieve a sustainable development within the realm of trade there is a need to continue the research on the incoherence between the regimes and concerned principles and what implications this incoherence might have. Furthermore, there is a need to discuss this conflict and what difficulties the outcome of the conflict imposes on the handling of environmental problems through policy making. There is also a need to further observe how the disagreement on how the Precautionary Principle should be applied displays in actual conflicts, as in the case presented within this study, the GMO related trade conflict between the EC and the US, Canada and Argentina. To further point on the significance of this study and its relevance, it has in recent strategies for Swedish socio-environmental research been stated that the research objectives concerning division of power and goal conflicts are of high importance for socioenvironmental research. Questions like who has the actual power in environmental politics and how are goal conflicts displayed and manifested on national and international level are seen as at the core of the issue (www.formas.se) and these questions will to some extent be discussed within this study.

Upholding the PP on GMOs is key to developing country exports to the EU.

**Shaw and Schwartz 5** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

Biotechnology is a challenging issue for developing countries as they seek to balance development objectives with the potential risks and beneﬁts of biotechnology. The trade implications of their choices in this respect can be daunting. There has been little consideration given internationally to ﬁnding ways to provide a balanced assessment of the potential for biotechnology for developing countries.81 By way of example, several African countries – including Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe – rejected donated maize derived from GM seeds during famines in 2002 and 2004.82 Also, **many developing countries** – **particularly in Africa** where the EU is a major export market for agricultural products – **are waiting to see the outcome of the Biotech dispute before deciding on a biosafety policy**. Naturally, they are concerned about the WTO-compatibility of any eventual policy. **Sri Lanka has back-tracked from a GMO ban for this reason**. Thus, the **repercussions of the** Biotech **dispute at the WTO could be far-reaching** beyond just the Parties involved in the dispute. **Although some developing countries produce GMOs** for domestic consumption, **few export GMO products**, **which is key to understanding the elevated proﬁle of the p**recautionary **p**rinciple in the Biosafety Protocol. Developing countries, which are in the process of developing a domestic framework for GMOs, have to balance their export interests with the desire to beneﬁt from biotechnology. **To preserve** their **exports of** conventional **ag**ricultural **products**, particularly **to the EU, some developing countries** are ﬁnding that they **need to maintain** a **“GMO-free” status**.83

Africa-EU trade is key to economic development in Africa.

**EC 12** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

The EU's trading partners should not see its commitment to free trade as a reason not to engage in trade liberalisation negotiations. It is true that **Europe** will not close its market but it **has a highly ambitious programme of negotiations with partners from** around the world, covering: • Asia – we are negotiating already with three ASEAN members who are likely soon to be joined by some of their other partners. We also hope soon to launch a highly significant FTA negotiation with Japan and talks on an investment agreement with China; • the Americas – where we want to complete the jigsaw of trade opening by launching a ground breaking agreement with the United States, concluding ambitious negotiations with Canada and cementing our ties with the Mercosur countries; and • **Africa** – **where** the **Economic Partnership Agreements** and European Neighbourhood Policy **have the potential to spur development by freeing up trade** and investment **across the whole continent**. Already today we have **trade agreements** either applied or concluded that **cover 26**.4**% of our imports. If we conclude** the **agreements we are currently negotiating as well as those we plan to launch in the** near **future, that figure would rise to 61**.8**%.** Those **countries that do not have preferential access to our market stand to see their competitive position eroded** if they do not take action by negotiating and signing free trade agreements with us.

The African economy is key to the global economy. **Ichikowitz 13** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

A significant change in the way the world’s leaders are starting to see Africa was revealed this week but has gone almost entirely unreported. Christine **Lagarde, the head of the** International Monetary Fund (**IMF**), was in Cote d’Ivoire’s capital, Abidjan, and identified conflict as the "enemy number one" of Africa’s economic growth. She **said**: "Security is too fragile … if there is no peace, the people simply won’t have the confidence or courage to invest in their own future and neither will (foreign investors)." However, Lagarde did not stop at security being significant merely because it crippled economic **development in Africa**. She said **i**t wa**s vital for the financial stability of the entire world.** "It’s clear that emerging countries are the motor of world economic growth," she said, backing the IMF’s projections that sub-Saharan Africa will grow 5.25% this year, second only to Asia’s boom economies and well above the world average of 3.6%. To hear the recognition from such a leading figure in the international community that security is one of Africa’s core problems was incredibly uplifting. It echoes statements I made last year, when I said: "Capitalism is the most powerful driving force behind Africa’s economic development…. Stability is crucial because the growing middle classes (up to a third of all Africans) will spend more money if they feel confident, and they will feel more confident if they feel safe. The next stage will be to convince private investors that no sudden, unexpected or violent shift in government will happen and make their funds disappear overnight." **Lagarde said: "I cannot help but be impressed by the continent’s resilience** … **in the face of** the most serious **disturbances seen by the world’s economy since the** Great **Depression."** While the leading economies are struggling to tiptoe back into growth, it is to Africa that the world is turning for impetus. Lagarde’s recognition of this is a minor historical moment in **Africa**’s relations with the rest of the world — instead of Africa being seen as a drain, it **has been accepted as a vital driver of the global economy** by one of its leading figures. Global leaders have previously come close but have never been so explicit. **When** US President Barack **Obama visited Ghana** in 2009**, he said: "Your prosperity can expand America’s.** Your health and security can contribute to the world’s…. All of us must strive for the peace and security necessary for progress." He also said that "development depends upon good governance" but I would say that, beyond this, good governance depends on stable societies. I would venture that Lagarde agrees. I have had the privilege to work with many African countries to strengthen the capabilities and capacity of their defence, police and peacekeeping forces. I have seen first-hand the benefits for economic activity, inward investment, regional stability and long-term growth that stability can bring. **Africa** cannot rely solely on its booming sectors, such as oil, for its growth. It **needs to build strong and wide economic foundations**. Its projected growth might be second only to Asia’s, but unlike Asia it is happening in the absence of the institutional framework necessary to absorb that growth and direct it towards more investment in things such as infrastructure, health, education and public transport.

Economic crisis causes nuclear war. **Royal 10** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances **Modelski and Thompson**’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, **find**ing **that** rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous **shocks** such as economic crises could **usher in a redistribution of** relative **power** (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing** the risk of **miscalculation** (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as **a rising power may** seek to **challenge a declining power** (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if** the **expectations of future trade decline**, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for **conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic **decline has also been linked with** an increase in the likelihood of **terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting **governments have** increased **incentive**s **to fabricate** external military **conflict**s **to create a “rally around the flag” effect**. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the fact the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

**Spillover Card**

The EU is key to the global economy.

**EC 12** writes[[14]](#footnote-14)

**The E**uropean **U**nion **is a central pillar of the world economy** – and will remain so. Although the EU may be projected to grow only very slowly in 2012 and 2013 **it remains the largest economy in the world**, with a per capita GDP of €25 000 for its 500 million consumers. That represents a €12.6 trillion economy. Only the United States (€11.5 trillion) is in the same league; even China (€4.6 trillion) and Japan (€4.2 trillion) are considerably smaller. **There are 135 E**uropean **U**nion **companies in the Fortune 500, more than the U**nited **S**tates (132), China (75) and Japan. Even if Europe were not to recover fully in the next year, it would still remain the largest economy in the world by a long shot. **It is also an economy that has enormous potential for the future**. **5 of the top 10 countries on the W**orld **E**conomic **F**orum **Global Competitiveness index are EU Members**.1 They make up 6 of the top 10 economies on the INSEAD/WIPO Global Innovation Index2 . This is borne out at a company level too: 28 of Forbes' top 100 companies are headquartered in the EU. The EU accounts for more than a quarter of world R&D spending and in 2009, it produced 29% of the scientific publications in the world compared to 22% from the United States, and 17% from China. Almost a third of the world's patent applications are filed in the EU. Europe's infrastructure is also unparalleled: It has 65,000 km of motorways and some of the busiest international airports in the world. (30 European airports carry more than 10 million passengers annually.) The EU also enjoys the largest network of high-speed railway tracks, 6,200 km and the highest number of high-speed trains (1,050 out of 1,737 in the world). In conclusion: **companies with global aspirations cannot afford to ignore this economy.**

# Gambling Advantage

## Link

Resource extraction benefits the gambling industry. The impact is domestic violence. **Benny-Morrison 13** writes[[15]](#footnote-15)

**RESOURCE-rich areas swarming with high income miners have been the saving grace for the gaming industry**. But with the increase in the number of miners choosing fly-in, fly-out agreements, the gambling industry predicts the rate of people playing the slots in resource corridors will fall. Among the biggest growth areas in regional Queensland in the 12 months up to November 2012 was Mackay. The amount of metered wins on pokie machines in Mackay clubs and hotels was $7.5 million higher than the same period in 2010-2011. The metered win is the amount left to venues after player winnings have been paid out but before tax. In November 2012, the most recent win figures provided by the Queensland Liquor and Gaming Office, Mackay venues clocked up $6.4 million in metered wins through the slots. Between November 2011 and November 2012, licensed establishments in the Central Queensland city recorded $82 million in metered winnings. In Gladstone and Rockhampton, venues ended up with $38.4 million and $68.75 million respectively over the same period. In Bundaberg, 1200 electronic gaming machines accumulated metered wins of $55.3 million and on the Fraser Coast, venues recorded $50.5 million. Queensland Hotels Association chief executive Justin O'Connor said Queensland had seen little growth in gambling since 2008 - except for resource-rich areas. "In the period since 2008 **electronic gaming revenue has been** generally **subdued** due to the cost-of-living pressures and the global financial crisis, **although some areas, particularly where there is resource extraction, have seen stronger growth**," he said. Mr O'Connor predicts the prevalence of gambling in resource rich areas could weaken as the trend in fly-in, fly-out arrangements for workers intensifies. Hotels and pubs in the Sunshine Coast region recorded a metered win of about $135 million for the same time frame. In Ipswich, pokie players spent an average of $1.48 million a day in the 12 months up until November 2012. The city's 1524 pokie machines had metered wins of $79.74 million over the 12-month period. Queensland Council of Social Services chief executive Mark Henley said **the** council's major **concern was** for **low-socio economic areas with high gambling rates**. "Its a concern a lot of the areas where there are high numbers of pokie machines and **opportunity for people to gamble** there is a high concentration of this in low income areas," he said. "It also **leads to** a lot of other issues such as **domestic violence** and mental health issues**. "We are really concerned over** the **areas of low incomes and how vulnerable the people already are**." The Office of Liquor and Gaming granted 76 new gaming machine licences in the 2011-2012 financial year and approved 107 applications for an increase in pokie machines at hotels and clubs. The Queensland gaming industry has a cap of about 24,000 gaming machines.

## DV Impacts

### Outweighs Death

Domestic violence is worse than death.

**Ewing 90** writes[[16]](#footnote-16)

In large measure, each of these rules, which seem to protect distinctly psy­chological values even at the expense of human life, may be viewed as expres­sions of the principle of autonomy: "The right to resist aggression broadly to cover threats to the personality of the victim . . . the moral claim of the person to autonomy over his life." Implicit in these rules-as well as in the proposed doctrine of psychological self-defense-is the well-grounded recognition that **the value of human life lies not in mere** physical **existence but** rather **in the capacity to experience that existence in a** psychologically **meaningful and rewarding fash­ion. When**, as in the experience of some **battered women**, **victimization becomes so severe that the capacity to function as an autonomous** (psychologically inte­grated and self-directed) **individual is lost,** severely impaired, or threatened with loss or severe impairment, **physical existence** ("life") **loses** much if not most of **its meaning and value.**

### Patriarchy

Domestic violence furthers patriarchy. **Berns 1** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

**Feminist constructions of domestic violence emphasize the role of gender** and power **in abusive relationships, including the fact that the overwhelming majority of victims are women. The** first major **strategy of** the **patriarchal**-resistance **discourse is to reframe the problem as "human violence." By removing gender from the framing of the problem, this perspective undermines the role of gender** and power **in abusive relationships.** This discursive strategy, which I refer to as degendering the problem, plays a central role in resisting any attempts to situate social problems within a patriarchal framework. Domestic violence is not the only form of violence that is degendered by critics of feminist constructions. Typical cases of men's everyday violence against intimates and acquaintances, including rape and incest, are obscured in the media by sensationalizing less common "stranger abuse" and "sick rapists" (Caringella-MacDonald 1998; Meyers 1997; Smart 1989; Soothill and Walby 1991; Websdale 1999). "**Media portrayals of rape are in these ways hegemonic, buttressing the patriarchy that undergirds** structural inequality and **sexism** and the rampant rape that these engender" (Caringella-MacDonald1 998, 63). In the case of domestic violence, where strangers are obviously not involved, human violence takes the place of "stranger danger" as a rhetorical tool for diverting attention from men's everyday violence.

Patriarchal thinking is the root cause of multiple scenarios for extinction.

**Warren and Cady 94** write[[18]](#footnote-18)

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and **pollution of** the **air, water, and soil** are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, **rest on the faulty belief**s that it is okay to "rape the earth," **that it is "man's** God-given **right" to have dominion** (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the **presumption** of warism, **that war is a natural**, righteous, and ordinary **way to impose dominion** on a people or nation**, goes hand in hand with patriarchy** and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current "unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with nuclear **prolif**eration**, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women**, which many feminists see as **[are] the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking.** In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. **Acknowledging** the context of **patriarchal** conceptualizations that feed **militarism is a first step toward** reducing their impact and **preserving life on Earth"** (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: **Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking** (**about women,** national and regional **conflict, [and] the environment**) **which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, will make life on earth** difficult, if not **impossible.** It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

### International Security

Empirics prove. Domestic violence against women increases the risk of conflict. **Hudson 12** writes[[19]](#footnote-19)

Well, here is some robust empirical evidence that we cannot ignore: **Using the largest** extant **database on** the status of **women** in the world today, which I created with three colleagues, we found that **there is a strong and** highly **significant link between state** security **and women's security**. In fact, the very best predictor of a state's peacefulness is not its level of wealth, its level of democracy, or its ethno-religious identity; the best predictor of a state's peacefulness is how well its women are treated. What's more, democracies with higher levels of violence against women are as insecure and unstable as nondemocracies. Our findings, detailed in our new book out this month, Sex and World Peace, echo those of other scholars, who have found that **the larger the gender gap** **between** the **treatment of men and women** in a society, **the more likely a country is to be involved in** intra- and interstate **conflict**, to be the first to resort to force in such conflicts, and to resort to higher levels of violence. On issues of national health, economic growth, corruption, and social welfare, the best predictors are also those that reflect the situation of women. **What happens to women** **affects the security**, stability, prosperity, **bellicosity**, corruption, health, regime type, **and** (yes) the **power of the state**. The days when one could claim that the situation of women had nothing to do with matters of national or international security are, frankly, over. **The empirical results** to the contrary **are just too numerous and** too **robust to ignore**. But as we look around at the world, the situation of women is anything but secure. **Our database rates countries** based on several categories of **women's security from 0 (best) to 4 (worst).** The scores were assigned based on a thorough search of the more than 130,000 data points in the WomanStats Database, with two independent evaluators having to reach a consensus on each country's score. On our scale measuring the physical security of women, no country in the world received a 0. Not one. The world average is 3.04, attesting to the widespread and persistent violence perpetrated against women worldwide, even among the most developed and freest countries. **The U**nited **S**tates, for instance, **scores a 2 on this scale, due to** the **relative prevalence of domestic violence** and rape. It's ironic that authors such as Steven Pinker who claim that the world is becoming much more peaceful have not recognized that **violence against women in many countries is**, if anything, **becoming more prevalent**, not less so, and dwarfs the violence produced through war and armed conflict. To say a country is at peace when its women are subject to femicide -- or to ignore violence against women while claiming, as Pinker does, that the world is now more secure -- is simply oxymoronic. The Worst Places to Be a Woman Gender-based violence is unfortunately ingrained in many cultures, so much so that it can take place not only during a woman's life but also before she is even born. On our scale measuring son preference and sex ratio, the world average is 2.41, indicating a generalized preference for sons over daughters globally. And in 18 countries, from Armenia to Vietnam, childhood sex ratios are significantly abnormal in favor of boys. The United Nations Population Fund suggests that, as of 2005, more than 163 million women were missing from Asia's population, whether through sex-selective abortion, infanticide, or other means. Demographer Dudley Poston of Texas A&M University has calculated that China will face a deficit of more than 50 million young adult women by the end of the decade. Think of the ways this imbalance will affect China's state stability and security -- and in turn its rise to world power -- in this century.
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